

NETWORK TELEPHONE ACTION PLAN

Purpose The purpose of this document is to present an Action Plan to assist in reducing the number of clarifications and increase electronic order flow through. This recommendation comes after a review of detailed clarification analysis.

Action Plan After reviewing order clarifications, I believe a concentrated effort in the following areas would decrease clarifications and increase your electronic flow through. By increasing electronic flow through, a significant cost reduction in LSR processing can be achieved. After careful consideration, if the following areas could be addressed, I think it would make a vast difference in provisioning orders and affect other areas where considerable time is spent.

Targeted Areas :

- **BellSouth Business Rules**
- **CSOTS**
- **USOC Manual**
- **Tariffs**
- **Service Interval Guide**
- **CCP (Change Control Process)**
- **Training**
- **Reduce clarification rate to less than 10% and sustain it over time**
- **Recommended Target Improvement Timeline:**

September	17%
October	16%
November	15%
December	14%
January, 2002	13%
February, 2002	12%
March, 2002	10%
- **Improve flow through to 90% for electronic orders and sustain it over time**
Recommended Target Improvement Timeline:

September	73%
October	75%
November	78%
December	80%
January, 2002	85%
February, 2002	88%
March, 2002	90%

Next Steps:

In January, 2002, evaluate the progress and update action plan, if appropriate, or at the request of either party (Network Tel. or BST).

**BellSouth
Business Rules**

The BellSouth Business Rules play a major factor in provisioning service orders. With the speed in which the FCC issues mandates, the business rules are constantly changing. I, as well as your provisioning people have a hard time keeping up with the changes.

My recommendation is to have a current hard copy on file and have it indexed and marked for the items that need to be looked up the most. **This information must be kept up-to-date with the most current revisions.** Additionally, incorporate information contained in Carrier Notification letters, participate in the various User Groups, and participate in the Change Control Process. If a person in each area could become your Business Rule expert and share their knowledge with the others as the business rules change.

*** An area for significant improvement is clarifications due to Invalid USOCs/FID information and RPONs**

****See attached document for WEB Site address**

CSOTS

CSOTS provides detailed order information on your orders. It provides the BellSouth order number, status and due date. This information should be on all orders as long as you have an FOC. By reviewing this report you can save valuable time when determining when action is necessary on an order.

For Example :

Have an order that was due yesterday. CSOTS shows that order in CP status, however your customer states service not working. IF the order is CP do not call the LCSC. Call either repair or the UNE MTNCE center depending on the order type. This will save time and effort. If the order is CP it is out of the LCSC center control.

The same in MA cases as well. IF the order is in MA status send in a SUPP to make a new Due Date.

These are just a couple of examples that can save time and allow your provisioning staff to handle more important issues.

***See attached document for WEB Site address**

**** A user ID and Password is required. This can be obtained from your Account Team.**

USOC Manual A large volume of clarifications and orders being provisioned incorrectly is for the wrong USOC. Certain USOCS are used for different classes of service. FIDS also play a major role.

My recommendation is to pull a hard copy of this document or purchase a hard copy of this document. I would then have someone be the USOC SME. A handbook or cheat sheet needs to be given to each person. The handbook needs to associate what USOC goes with the different class of service. This accounts for a large number of clarifications.

Examples :

List Class of Services USOCS (Residence, Business, UNE-P, Complex and UNE) Associate Call Waiting, Caller Id Call Forwarding USOCS that go with each Class of Service.

Associate as many USOCS, FIDS and Class Of Service as possible and then you will have the combinations together.

***See attached document for WEB Site address**

Tariff

The Tariff plays a major factor in providing information.

It is important that as many people as possible know how to search both the General and FCC tariffs.

BellSouth has added a new search engine to use in locating information in the tariffs found on the WEB site. The General and FCC tariff for all 9 BellSouth states can be found on the WEB.

***See attached document for WEB Site address**

Service Interval Guide

The service interval guide provides due date intervals for services offered. These guides can assist in the provisioning of orders. This will provide a guide for the dates to be assigned on the order.

***See attached document for WEB Site address**

Carrier Notification

The WEB site provides for the posting of important issues for the CLECs. It is vital this is reviewed on a daily basis and all changes communicated to all provisioning staff. This can impact the issuing of orders.

***See attached document for WEB Site address**

Training I would recommend that the CLEC Training Web Site be viewed and review what is available to assist in provisioning of orders. This can be either attended individually or in some cases the training can be suit cased to your location.

Additionally, BellSouth Professional Services can tailor training to specific needs of Network Telephone.

***See attached document for WEB Site address**

Change Control Process - CCP The Change Control Process can be a valued asset to Network Telephone. I encourage you to participate in this process. This process allows the CLECS the opportunity to have input in the changes we make in our processes, documentation change and features to our electronic systems. You can send in request, view pending request and attend meetings to have your voice heard.
****WEB SITE ADDRESS**
<http://www.interconnection.bellsouth.com>
Select Local Exchange Carriers
Select Change Control Process

BellSouth Initiatives BellSouth continues to improve our internal processes and partner with Network Telephone for success.

- Team with Network Telephone to evaluate Network Telephone's internal order flow to determine any potential process improvements
 1. Understand complete order flow from beginning through to Billing
 2. Determine what OSS edits are within Network Telephone's internal platform and identify which ones can be added to reduce clarifications
 3. Review current training and documentation to ensure information being utilized is as current as possible with updates
 4. Jointly discuss the linkage between Network Telephone's Training and Operations

Summary

This Action Plan is simply a recommendation to further the goal of both BellSouth and Network Telephone being successful. The recommendations made are based upon the analysis performed on clarifications and incorrect orders. Based on the analysis, some of the same items have been communicated to the LCSC centers at BellSouth. The overall success of this Action Plan is that it be communicated to Network Telephone's provisioning group. This document is not a contract, simply a re-affirmation of Network Telephone and BellSouth efforts to partner together for success. I would like to ask that both parties sign-off on this summary to simply confirm that both parties have reviewed this document. Together we can improve the clarification and flow through rate.

Vinnie Oddo, Chief Operating Officer, Network Telephone	Date
Mitch Dantin, Vice President – Order Management, Network Telephone	Date
Michael Wilburn, Sales Director, BellSouth	Date
Kathryn Ray, Director-Customer Support Managers, BellSouth	Date
Scott Griffin, Account Executive, BellSouth	Date
Cynthia Hodges, Industrial Specialist, BellSouth	Date
Joyce Martin - Customer Support Manager, BellSouth	Date

Mechanized Clarification and FlowThrough Totals

Date	OCN	LENS	EDI	TAG	Total LSR's	Valid LSR's	Issued Svc Ords	Auto Clar	Pending sups	CLEC Caused	Clar Totals	Total Clar %	Flow Through
Jan-2001	8772	449	0	0	449	349	272	35	7	9	51	11.36%	80.00%
Feb-2001	8772	855	0	4	859	647	421	107	17	22	146	17.00%	67.36%
Mar-2001	8772	1502	0	2	1504	1048	625	127	38	100	265	17.62%	65.93%
Apr-2001	8772	1313	57	0	1370	947	502	142	30	89	261	19.05%	58.51%
May-2001	8772	1507	159	4	1670	1137	623	211	24	122	357	21.38%	61.38%
Jun-2001	8772	1385	152	0	1537	1062	468	186	38	90	314	20.43%	48.15%
Jul-2001	8772	875	45	0	920	631	428	106	20	48	174	18.91%	73.41%
Aug-2001	8772	520	50	0	570	419	332	50	6	26	82	14.39%	84.48%
Sep-2001	8772	367	17	0	384	259	207	57	6	22	85	22.14%	87.34%
TOTAL		8773	480	10	9263	6499	3878	1021	186	528	1735	18.73%	64.95%
Jan-2001	8773	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Feb-2001	8773	0	0	18	18	11	7	6	1	0	7	38.89%	63.64%
Mar-2001	8773	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Apr-2001	8773	3	0	0	3	2	0	1	0	1	2	66.67%	0.00%
May-2001	8773	216	0	0	216	183	101	8	2	16	26	12.04%	60.48%
Jun-2001	8773	2075	8	0	2083	1623	769	219	25	151	395	18.96%	52.24%
Jul-2001	8773	2104	291	0	2395	1688	1349	279	33	110	422	17.62%	85.49%
Aug-2001	8773	2526	375	0	2901	2152	1811	256	32	124	412	14.20%	89.30%
Sep-2001	8773	963	358	0	1321	916	742	106	10	69	185	14.00%	87.60%
TOTAL		7887	1032	18	8937	6575	4779	875	103	471	1449	16.21%	78.29%

Prepared By: Joyce D. Martin
October 23, 2001

Date	OCN	LENS	EDI	TAG	Total LSR's	Valid LSR's	Issued Svc Ords	Auto Clar	Pending sups	CLEC Caused	Clar Totals	Total Clar %	Flow Through
Jan-2001	All	449	0	0	449	349	272	35	7	9	51	11.36%	80.00%
Feb-2001	All	855	0	22	877	658	428	113	18	22	153	17.46%	67.30%
Mar-2001	All	1502	0	2	1504	1048	625	127	38	100	265	17.62%	65.93%
Apr-2001	All	1316	57	0	1373	949	502	143	30	90	263	19.16%	58.44%
May-2001	All	1723	159	4	1886	1320	724	219	26	138	383	20.31%	61.25%
Jun-2001	All	3460	160	0	3620	2685	1237	405	63	241	709	19.59%	50.61%
Jul-2001	All	2979	336	0	3315	2319	1777	385	53	158	596	17.98%	82.23%
Aug-2001	All	3046	425	0	3471	2571	2143	306	38	150	494	14.23%	88.52%
Sep-2001	All	1330	375	0	1705	1175	949	163	16	91	270	15.84%	87.55%
TOTAL	ALL	16660	1512	28	18200	13074	8657	1896	289	999	3184	17.49%	71.69%

RESH/OCN	CLEC'S COMPANY CODE
LENS	FORM OF INTERFACE USED TO SUBMIT ORDERS
EDI	FORM OF INTERFACE USED TO SUBMIT ORDERS
TAG	FORM OF INTERFACE USED TO SUBMIT ORDERS
TOTAL MECH LSR'S	COUNT OF MECHANIZED ORDERS SUBMITTED TO BST
VALID LSR'S	COUNT OF ORDERS THAT WERE NOT CLARIFIED OR REJECTED
ISSUED SVC ORD'S	COUNT FROM THE VALID LSR'S COLUMN THAT MECHANICALLY GENERATED A SERVICE ORDER
AUTO CLARIFICATION	COUNT OF MECHANIZED ORDERS THAT WERE AUTOCLARIFIED BACK TO THE CLEC
PENDING SUPS	CLEC SENDS SUP ON PON IN ERROR STATUS
CLEC CAUSED FALLOUT	COUNT OF ORDERS THAT FELL OUT TO THE LCSC FOR MANUAL HANDLING THAT WERE CLARIFIED BACK TO THE CLEC BY AN LCSC REP
CLARIFICATION TOTALS	SUM OF AUTO CLAR + PENDING SUPS + CLEC CAUSED
TOTAL CLARIFICATION %	AUTO CLARIFICATION + PENDING SUPS + CLEC CAUSED FALLOUT/TOTAL MECH LSR'S
FLOW THROUGH %	ISSUED SVC ORDERS / (VALID LSRs-CLEC CAUSED ERRORS)

Prepared By: Joyce D. Martin
October 23, 2001

NETWORK TELEPHONE

8772/8773

TOP CLARIFICATIONS	Recommended ways to reduce/eliminate clarifications
Account Denied/Disconnected/Final	Review CSR prior to submitting LSR
ACT Code Invalid/Incorrect/Missing	Review BellSouth Business Rules
Address Invalid/Incorrect/Missing	Utilize the pre-ordering functionality, i.e. LENS inquiry to validate address prior to submitting LSR
Class of Service Incorrect/Invalid	Review BellSouth Business Rules
Duplicate PON	
End User Does Not Match CSR	Review CSR prior to submitting LSR
Hunting Information Invalid/Incorrect/Missing	Review BellSouth Business Rules and CSR prior to submitting LSR
Pending Service Order Activity/Requested Activity Already Pending	Review CSR prior to submitting LSR
RPON Information Invalid/Incorrect/Missing	Ensure all clarifications are reviewed daily
Type of Service Invalid/Incorrect/Missing	Review BellSouth Business Rules
USOC and FIDs Invalid/Incorrect/Missing/Already Exists on Account	Review BellSouth Business Rules for information regarding USOCs, LEO Guide, USOC Guide, and FID Glossary

To further support the above "Recommended Ways To Reduce/Eliminate Clarifications" listed below are some additional suggestions:

1. Utilize BellSouth Professional Services to develop training specifically for targeted areas of improvement, i.e., USOCs and FIDs, TOS, ACT, etc.
2. Implement a Quality Control group/person within Network Telephone.
3. Drive down to a working level information disseminated through the Change Change Control Process, Carrier Notification letters, changes to the BellSouth Business Rules-Local Ordering (BBR-LO).
4. Link Network Tel. Training Department to changes made through Carrier Notification letters, Change Control Process and results of analysis of errors which impact flowthrough.
5. Provide additional training on how to use the BellSouth Interconnection web site.
6. Analyze the LSRs sent manually to determine why these are not sent mechanically.

TRAINING:

Professional Services offers specialized training and will customize any training needs for Network Telephone.

Network Telephone provided a list of training needs. With the assistance of Dottie Amerson, Professional Services, we have categorized these needs into 4 groups: (1) Basic Training, (2) Complex Training, and (3) Customized Training On Simple Services and (4) Listing Training. Listed below are the groupings for these categories.

Basic Training (Approx. 2 days)	Complex Training (Approx. 2 days)	Customized Training (Approx. 1 day)	Listing (BAPCO)
Transfer Orders	Off-Premise Extensions	Surrogate Client Numbers	Directory Listing Training
Remote Call Forwarding (RCFs)	Change orders for Complex svcs.	Terminology Class for DSL circuits	Caption Requests (DLR)
How to navigate through the tariffs, LEO Guide, to locate restrictions on USOCs, and compatible features, identifying FIDs	Hunting with terminals	How to read CSRs	Rules to follow when converting/transferring Non-published Telephone Numbers
Basic Provisioning Rules	How to complete LSR for PBX, DIDs, RCF, MEGA Link?		
Proper procedures for submitting requests to correct CSR			
Call Intercepts			
Limitations on Dual Service			
How to provision hunting and completing the LSR			

The cost for trainings is as follows:

\$400/day per student plus travel expenses for the Instructor

A training class on UNE-P is scheduled for open enrollment on December 5 & 6. The cost of this class is as follows:

\$350/day per student plus expenses for student.

BAPCO offers the Listing training.

Prepared By: Joyce Martin – Customer Support Manager
October 22, 2001

FLORIDA OSS BELLSOUTH'S RESPONSE TO EXCEPTION 88



Florida OSS Test
Exception 88

July 25, 2001

EXCEPTION REPORT

Exception:

The BellSouth Change Control Prioritization Process does not allow CLECs to be involved in prioritization of all CLEC impacting Change Requests. (PPR1)

Background:

The Change Control Prioritization (CCP) Process is the method used by both CLECs and BellSouth to rank the importance of both CLEC and BellSouth-initiated change requests. The Prioritization process is outlined in the description of Step Five of the overall Change Control process¹ in the BellSouth Change Control Process document².

BellSouth also utilizes an internal prioritization process in conjunction with the CCP. The internal prioritization process occurs during Step Seven of the Change Control Process and includes review of the ranking determined by the CLECs during Step Five of the Change Control Process. The process is as follows:

- The Release Prioritization Team considers all changes from a variety of sources including the (external) Change Control Process, the Third Party Testing Team, the Regulatory Team, and the LCSC and prioritizes them into one master list.
- The Release Prioritization Team creates the master list and integrates the changes from the different sources using the following procedure: The number one priority change requested from each group is ranked in the master list from one to five with one being the highest. The team then ranks the number two priority change requests from each group from six to ten. The number three priority change requests are ranked from 11 to 15 and so forth.
- Additional factors are considered during the reprioritization process and may result in one customer group having a disproportionate number of Change Requests ranked at the top of the master list. These additional considerations are as follows:
 - i. Regulatory changes that have been mandated and are due during this release cycle are prioritized first.

¹ Pages 28-29 and page 47.

² v. 2.3, May 18, 2001

FLORIDA OSS BELLSOUTH'S RESPONSE TO EXCEPTION 88

- ii. Change Requests that have related functions are given a higher priority than standalone changes.
- iii. Change Requests that are necessary for proper system operation are given a high priority.
- iv. Change Requests that are necessary for or concurrent with the implementation of additional change requests are given high priority.

During interviews with members of the BellSouth Internal Change Management Team conducted by KPMG Consulting, BellSouth asserted that all change requests included in the master prioritization list are related to the Wholesale portion of BellSouth's business.

The BellSouth Change Control Process³ states that the BellSouth Change Control Process is designed to manage all change requests "that affect external users of BellSouth's Electronic Interface Applications, associated manual process improvements, performance or ability to provide service including defect/expedite notification."

Issue:

CLECs are unable to participate in the prioritization of change requests that originate from internal BellSouth organizations (Regulatory Team, Third Party testing Team, the LCSC, and Project Managers) that affect BellSouth's Wholesale business and therefore the CLEC Community. This policy inhibits one of the primary objectives of the CCP "to allow for mutual impact assessment and resource planning to manage and schedule changes."

Impact:

BellSouth's Internal Change Management Prioritization Process does not allow the CLEC community to participate in prioritization of change requests that effect CLEC Business. The CLEC Community's lack of participation in change requests that effect CLEC business could result in change requests important to the CLEC Community not being developed or implemented in a timely manner.

BellSouth Response:

The Change Control Prioritization Process does allow CLECs to be involved in the prioritization of CLEC impacting Change Requests. A CLEC impacting Change Request is defined as, "Any change that either requires the CLEC to modify the way it operates or causes it to rewrite system code." Examples of this are:

³ Version 2.3, May 18, 2001

FLORIDA OSS BELLSOUTH'S RESPONSE TO EXCEPTION 88

- Business rule LSR field usage changes
- New functionality for an interface
- Change existing functionality for an interface
- New REQTYPs
- New field on the LSR form
- Electronic ordering of a product/service

This definition should impact the majority of the CLEC community, if not the entire community, since it is impossible to know how each CLEC has coded its systems.

CLEC impacting change requests may originate from various sources: the (external) Change Control Process, the Third Party Testing Team, the Regulatory Team, the LCSC, or Project Managers. It is transparent to the CLECs what internal BellSouth entity is the actual originator of a request since the originator is only identified, on the Change Request form, as BellSouth. Thus, CLECs have already prioritized Change Requests originated by internal BellSouth organizations in four separate Change Review Meetings. Mandates are not prioritized by the CLECs per the Change Control Process.

All such Change Requests should come through the Change Control Process providing the CLECs an opportunity to prioritize them. As a result of BellSouth's commitment to provide CLECs the ability to participate in the prioritization of these requests, BellSouth has a better understanding of what is important to the CLEC community.

FLORIDA OSS BELLSOUTH'S RESPONSE TO EXCEPTION 106



Florida OSS Test
Exception 106

September 26, 2001

EXCEPTION REPORT

An exception has been identified as a result of test activities associated with the Documentation Review of the Change Management Process (PPR1).

Exception:

The BellSouth IT Team does not have criteria to develop the scope of a Release Package (PPR1).

Background:

The BellSouth Internal Change Management Process is the process used by BellSouth to implement changes to its OSS. The process includes initiation, validation, prioritization, sizing, development and implementation of all proposed changes. These changes are proposed by both BellSouth Internal Groups and the CLEC Community. Proposed changes are routed through a series of prioritization steps and then submitted to the BellSouth IT team. The BellSouth IT Team then determines which of the proposed changes it will implement as well as the schedule for implementation.

Issue:

The BellSouth IT Team methods and procedures documentation¹ does not provide the criteria utilized by the BellSouth IT Team to develop the priorities, capacity, and capabilities of a software release nor does it provide an explanation of how scenarios are built.

Impact:

Documentation of the BellSouth IT Team criteria for scope development of a release is necessary to provide systematic, consistent and repeatable implementation of change requests. The lack of established and documented development criteria may result in the BellSouth IT team overlooking and/or ignoring important change requests. Important change requests that remain unimplemented prevent CLECs from receiving requested order and pre-order functionality that may allow CLECs to compete more effectively in the local exchange carrier market. Furthermore, the lack of criteria may create delays and/or obstacles for BellSouth in its efforts to implement the new Release Management system that has been proposed for integration into the Change Management process.

¹ Encore Capacity Scoping Process, provided by BellSouth 6/14/01

FLORIDA OSS BELLSOUTH'S RESPONSE TO EXCEPTION 106

BellSouth Response:

The BellSouth IT Team utilizes the strategies described in the attached proprietary "Encore Electronic Interface Ordering (EIO) Application Rolling Release Plan" for scope development of Release Packages.

FLORIDA OSS BELLSOUTH'S RESPONSE TO OBSERVATION 108



Florida OSS Test
Observation #108

Date: August 16, 2001

OBSERVATION REPORT

KPMG Consulting has identified an observation as a result of the POP Functional Evaluation (TVV-1).

Observation:

BellSouth Business Rules for Local Ordering - OSS99¹, contains inconsistent and incomplete instructions necessary for Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs) to access and use BellSouth's systems. (TVV1)

Background:

CLECs rely heavily on complete and accurate information from *BellSouth Business Rules for Local Ordering - OSS99* that consistently and completely outline the methods and procedures for ordering local service from BellSouth.

Issues:

KPMG Consulting has identified inconsistent or incomplete guidelines resulting from *BellSouth Business Rules for Local Ordering - OSS99 Issue 90*.

Incident Type	Description	BellSouth's Findings
Inconsistent Documentation	For REQTYPE A/ACT D requests, the chart on page 276 states that the LS form /screen is required. This chart also states that the LNA is "prohibited unless SECNCI is populated" for this REQTYPE/ACT combination. The LNA field, however, is always required on the LS form.	Agree: On REQTYPE A/ ACT D, a note will be added to the BellSouth Business Rules for Local Ordering (BBR-LO) that states on Non-Designed REQTYPE A /ACT D the Loop Services page is not required. This update will be in the September 28, 2001 updates to the BBR-LO.
Inconsistent Documentation	For Direct Inward Dialing (DID) Resale service, the R/C/O chart for REQTYPE N/ ACT C(pages 813-814) reflects that this service request is supported electronically and manually. Furthermore, the "Types of Complex Products/Services" chart (Section 13.3) lists the complex products that can only be ordered manually but does not include REQTYPE N/ACT C and ACT D, which supports KPMG Consulting's understanding that such requests may be ordered electronically. KPMG	Agree: ACT D will be corrected to reflect (m) next to each field on the R/C/O Table for Direct Inward Dialing (DID) REQTYPE N/ACT D which cannot be ordered electronically. Verbiage will also be added for REQTYPE N ACT C to reflect that Adding Telephone Numbers to an existing Block of Numbers, and Adding a Block of

¹ *BellSouth Business Rules for Local Ordering - OSS99, Issue 90 June 29, 2001*. This document can be found at the following URL: <http://www.interconnection.bellsouth.com/guides/html/leo.html>

FLORIDA OSS BELLSOUTH'S RESPONSE TO OBSERVATION 108

Incident Type	Description	BellSouth's Findings
	Consulting, however, discovered that BellSouth does not electronically support REQ TYP N/ACT C and REQ TYP N/ACT D requests through communication with a BellSouth Customer Service Manager (CSM). ²	Telephone Numbers to an existing Block of numbers are the only C order activities that can be ordered electronically. This update will be in the September 28, 2001 updates to the BBR-LO.
Inconsistent and Incomplete Documentation	PON 020011FPMC010027 Version 2 (CC 9990) was a REQ TYP E/ACT N (non-complex) request that was submitted manually and received an error stating that the Line Class of Service (LNECLS SVC) field needs to be populated. Communication with two BellSouth representatives and one manager from the Local Carrier Service Center (LCSC) regarding this error confirmed that the LCSC could not complete this request unless the LNECLS SVC is populated on the order. According to the R/C/O chart on pages 595-596 (RS form with LNA of N), LNECLS SVC, however, is only required for electronic ordering. Additionally, there is no LNECLS SVC field located on the manual RS form. Further communication with the LCSC revealed that the LNECLS SVC value should be populated in the FEATURE field of the manual RS form.	Agree: For manual ordering with LNA of N, C, or V, the Line Class of Service USOC must be populated in the Feature section along with the FA (Feature Activity) field. Verbiage will be added to clarify the usages. These updates will appear with BBR-LO release scheduled for 08/28/2001.

Impact:

Omissions and errors in BellSouth documentation may increase operating costs, and decrease customer satisfaction. A lack of consistency and completeness may cause undue errors, and require additional CLEC resources to research solutions. Errors may also reduce the timeliness with which services can be provided to CLEC customers.

BellSouth's Response:

BellSouth's findings have been incorporated in the table above.

² Communication with the CSM occurred in relation to error responses returned on PON 061041FPEZ000001 (Version 00, CC 9993) and PON 060011FPEZ002001 (Version 00, CC 9993).



Change Request Form

To be completed by BCCM only:

(1) CHANGE REQUEST LOG #	CR 0424
-----------------------------	---------

DATE SENT (2a):	06/11/01
-----------------	----------

(2) STATUS	N
---------------	---

To be completed by CCM or BellSouth:

(3) REQUEST TYPE	<input type="checkbox"/> TYPE 2 (REGULATORY)	<input type="checkbox"/> TYPE 3 (INDUSTRY)	TYPE 4 (BST)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TYPE 5 (CLEC)
	<input type="checkbox"/> TYPE 6 (DEFECT) NOTE: COMPLETE SECTION 2	<input type="checkbox"/> EXPEDITED FEATURE	<input type="checkbox"/> FLOW-THRU	

SECTION 1

(4) COMPANY NAME	Network Telephone
(5) OCN	8772/8773
(6) CCM NAME	Kyle Kopytchak
(7) TELEPHONE NUMBER	850-469-9904-1250
(8) CCM EMAIL ADDRESS	Kyle.Kopytchak@networktelephone.net
(9) CCM FAX NUMBER	850-432-0218
(10) ALTERNATE CCM NAME	Brent McMahon
(11) ALTERNATE PHONE NUMBER	850-469-9904-1744
(12) ORIGINATOR'S NAME	Kyle Kopytchak

Attachment A-1



Change Request Form

(13) ORIGINATOR'S PHONE NUMBER	850-469-9904-1250
(14) TITLE OF CHANGE REQUEST	UDC Ordering Process

(15) CATEGORY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ADD NEW FUNCTIONLITY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CHANGE EXISTING
(16) DESIRED DUE DATE		

(17) ORIGINATING CCM ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HIGH	<input type="checkbox"/> MEDIUM	<input type="checkbox"/> LOW	
(18) ORIGINATING CCM ASSESSMENT OF PRIORITY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> URGENT	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGH	<input type="checkbox"/> MEDIUM	<input type="checkbox"/> LOW

(19) INTERFACES IMPACTED				
PRE-ORDERING	<input type="checkbox"/> LENS	<input type="checkbox"/> TAG	<input type="checkbox"/> CSOTS	
ORDERING	<input type="checkbox"/> EDI	<input type="checkbox"/> LENS	<input type="checkbox"/> TAG	<input type="checkbox"/> LNP
MAINTENANCE	<input type="checkbox"/> TAFI	<input type="checkbox"/> EC-TA Local		
MANUAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Manual			

(20) TYPE OF CHANGE (Check one or more, as applicable)				
<input type="checkbox"/> Software	<input type="checkbox"/> Product & Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Hardware	<input type="checkbox"/> New or Revised Edits
<input type="checkbox"/> Regulatory	<input type="checkbox"/> Industry Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Process	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Defect
<input type="checkbox"/> Expedited Feature	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flow Through			

(21) DESCRIPTION OF REQUESTED CHANGE (Including purpose and benefit received from this change. Include attachments if available)	The Non-mechanized ordering process includes faxing paper orders to LCSC for numerous products that BST offers; specific to this request for Network Telephone: Unbundled Digital Copper (UDC). For well over a year, illegible conditions occur as a result of either fax procedures and/or BST scanning documents into their online systems for which jeopardy's, double jeopardy's, rejections, and clarifications occur. Until such time as BST creates a mechanized process, an email ordering process is requested.
(22) REQ TYP(s) IMPACTED:	AB
(23) ACT TYP(s) IMPACTED:	N
(24) PROVIDE EXAMPLE OF REQUESTED CHANGE:	UDC orders are created in Microsoft Word template forms, printed and faxed to LCSC. Request sending via email.
(25) Identify the LCSC version	

Attachment A-1

Jointly Developed by the Change Control Sub-team comprised of BellSouth and CLEC Representatives.



Change Request Form

that are affected by this change

This section to be completed by BellSouth only:

(26) Does this request require clarification?

☐ YES ☒ NO

(27) Clarification Request Sent

(28) Clarification Response Due

(29) Change Request Review Date

(30) Target Implementation Date

(31) Change Review Meeting Results

07/06/01

BellSouth does recognize that not all products can currently be submitted electronically. However, BellSouth's goals and objectives are to continue developing mechanization of all products utilizing existing interfaces. BellSouth utilizes FAX servers for manually submitted LSR, which provides an electronic copy of all LSR, submitted via FAX for printing, processing, tracking and retention. BellSouth is starting the process for the development of the electronic requirements for this product. This will be a BellSouth issue and will be presented to the CLEC community through the CCP process for prioritization.

8/21/01 – updated response

It's is BellSouth's goal to mechanize all newly developed products. At the time the 7/6/01 response was provided, the mechanization of UDC was in the initial discussion phase. Network Telephone's change request for mechanization of UDC will be managed through the Flow Through Task Force. CR0424, which is to provide an email ordering process as an interim to mechanization of UDC, cannot be supported by BellSouth. BellSouth's policy is all manually submitted LSRs must be received via facsimile by BellSouth's Local Carrier Service Centers (LCSC) per Carrier Notification Letter SN91081871 posted 8/9/00.

08/31/01 BST request status from CLEC regarding this request.

08/31/01 Kyle (CLEC) sent Email stating that several CLECs and the FL PSC have expressed interest in pursuing the email process at LCSC in place of faxing orders for service not mechanized. I would like time to gain information and continue to pursue this.

CMT referred this request to the internal SME for further review.

09/26/01 On CLEC Monthly Status Conference Call, Kyle explained that all services are not mechanized. This request will provide e-mail capabilities for those services that are manual. Support was received from all CLECs regarding this request. CMT will respond to CLEC on Appeal.

10/26/01 At Monthly Status Meeting (Face to Face) CLEC requested SME be available at 11/14/01 meeting to further explain the response that based on the ERT notification dated 8/9/01, UDC product should be ordered via fax.

Attachment A-1

Jointly Developed by the Change Control Sub-team comprised of BellSouth and CLEC Representatives.



Change Request Form

--	--

(32) CANCELED CHANGE REQUEST	<input type="checkbox"/> DUPLICATE	<input type="checkbox"/> TRAINING	<input type="checkbox"/> CLARIFICATION NOT RECEIVED
(33) CANCELLATION ACKNOWLEDGMENT	<input type="checkbox"/> CLEC	<input type="checkbox"/> BST	DATE:

(34) APPEAL	<input type="checkbox"/> YES	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
(35) APPEAL CONSIDERATIONS		

SECTION 2

This section to be completed by CLEC/BellSouth- External Explanation of Type 6 Defect Change Request

(36) PON #	
(37) ERROR MESSAGE:	
(38) RELEASE OR API VERSION (If applicable)	
(39) DESCRIPTION OF DEFECT SCENARIO:	

SECTION 3

This section to be completed by BellSouth - Internal Validation of Defect Change Request

(40) DEFECT VALIDATION RESULTS:	
(41) CLARIFICATION NEEDED:	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
(42) VALIDATED DEFECT IMPACT LEVEL:	<input type="checkbox"/> HIGH <input type="checkbox"/> MEDIUM <input type="checkbox"/> LOW
(43) VALIDATION TYPE:	<input type="checkbox"/> DEFECT <input type="checkbox"/> FEATURE <input type="checkbox"/> TRAINING ISSUE <input type="checkbox"/> DUPLICATE
(44) DEFECT IMPACTS OTHER CLECS?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
(45) INTERFACES IMPACTED BY DEFECT:	<input type="checkbox"/> EDI <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> LNP <input type="checkbox"/> LENS <input type="checkbox"/> TCIF 7 <input type="checkbox"/> TCIF 9
(46) TARGET IMPLEMENTATION DATE:	

Attachment A-1

Jointly Developed by the Change Control Sub-team comprised
of BellSouth and CLEC Representatives.



Change Request Form

The Non-mechanized ordering process includes faxing paper orders to LCSC for numerous products that BST offers; specific to this request for Network Telephone: Unbundled Digital Copper (UDC). For well over a year, illegible conditions occur as a result of either fax procedures and/or BST scanning documents into their online systems for which jeopardy's, double jeopardy's, rejections, and clarifications occur. Until such time as BST creates a mechanized process, an email ordering process is requested.

Systemic to NTC

Data from Daily Operational Reports: Orders submitted May 10/01 through June 8/01, 8773 manual. Note: This is only for one month. Network Telephone would request 12 months of data for which BST obtains so as to research a historical trend.

350 orders

42 rejections

12% rejection rate

26 illegible rejections

7.4% of 12% illegible rejections

62 % of rejections are illegible

Systemic to CLEC industry

- A recent conversation with BST's Complex Resale Support Group (CRSG) has stipulated that they too agree that a review of the manual ordering procedures should be conducted, and that an email process has been requested.

Below are CLEC's throughout the country that too have had issues with the manual ordering process within LCSC and support an email request inherent to a full process review.

- Covad Communications
Colette Davis
678-641-7180
CoDavis@Covad.COM
- Access Point Inc
Jared Welch
800-957-6468
Jared.Welch@accesspointinc.com
- Stratos oil and gas
Sheryl Scobel
sheryl_scobel@stratosoilandgas.com
- Velocity Networks of Kentucky
Ross Costanzo
rcostanzo@velocityky.com

Attachment A-1



Change Request Form

LCSC has rejected claims to move to email, citing a production line process. They contend that one person would have to observe email while the entire team is able to walk by and grab faxed orders. Network Telephone and other CLEC's throughout the country contend that a review of the manual ordering process and the associated costs warrant attention so as to reduce the irreparable damage and associated back office costs.

Please also note: Other BST departments, including this very own Change Control Process, utilize an email platform.

Kyle Kopytchak
Process Measurement
Network Telephone
KyleK@Networktelephone.net
850.469.9904.1250
888.432.4855.4.1250

Attachment A-1

Jointly Developed by the Change Control Sub-team comprised
of BellSouth and CLEC Representatives.



Change Request Form

Attachment A-4A

Jointly Developed by the Change Control Sub-team comprised
of BellSouth and CLEC Representatives.

10-17-01 FTTF Conference Call Action Items

The following are action items that came from the 10-17-01 FTTF Conference Call. The first question and answer is in regards to a point of contact for PMAP reports. The second question and answer is in regards to open CMVCs prior to the implementation of the FTTF.

1Q) Question: "Who should be the Point of Contact for CLECs that have questions regarding PMAP data?"

1A) Answer: "Phil Porter with PMAP should be the first point of contact. He can be reached at 404 927-2182"

2Q) Question: "If BellSouth has an open CMVC Prior to the formation of the FTTF, can it be moved to the FTTF as a Type 2?"

2A) Answer: BellSouth will agree to bring items into the FTTF that already have an open CMVC prior to the formation of the FTTF. If the CLECs agree and understand that by doing so these would automatically become Type 2 requests and therefore could possibly lower in ranking any other prioritized CCP CR's.

Please send an acknowledgement of agreement to answer 2A if this process is acceptable to the CLEC community involved with the FTTF through CCP that will in turn funnel all responses to Gary Jones.

Kyle Kopytchak

From: Kyle Kopytchak
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2001 11:11 AM
To: 'Change.Control@bridge.bellsouth.com'; Alan.Flanigan@twtelecom.com; alee@epicus.com; alejandro@amexcomm.com; amanda.hill@wcom.com; Annette.Cook@espire.net; annettey@lightyearcom.com; apatel3@telcordia.com; Lynn.Arthur@BellSouth.com; avincent@communitytelephone.com; bbil@4pra.com; BellSouth@quintessent.net; best2@surfsouth.com; bethh@communitytelephone.com; beverly.lockwood@btitele.com; billg@telcordia.com; blsinterfacecontrol@kpmg.com; bmurdo@KMCTELECOM.COM; Bob.Buerrosse@allegiancetelecom.com; bobik@att.com; bradbury@att.com; Brenda.Gant@KMCTELECOM.COM; Brent McMahan; bseigler@att.com; BStowe@City.marietta.GA.US; bszafran@covad.com; bwellman@idstelcom.com; c-david.burley@wcom.com; c-Lorraine.Watson@wcom.com; c_and_m@bellsouth.net; caren.schaffner@wcom.com; CASHford@birch.com; Cassandra Pressley; Catherine.Gray@alltel.com; cbnaadmin@home.com; cchiavatti@usatelecominc.com; cdiacovelli@att.com; CDrake@City.marietta.GA.US; Cecere.Chris@broadband.att.com; cecilia.ortiz@adelphiacom.com; Cedric.Cox@wcom.com; cflanigan@uslec.com; changecontrol.bellsouth@onepointcom.com; Chapmanwe@cep.b.com; charles.a.stahlberger@xo.com; charrison@mpowercom.com; chaynes@Trivergent.com; cheryl@eatel.com; cheryl_acosta@stratosoilandgas.com; chrisg@pvtel.net; Christine.Schnelle@wcom.com; christine.shelton@cc.gte.com; clarson@dset.com; clhawk@KMCTELECOM.COM; CoDavis@covad.com; colleen.e.sponseller@wcom.com; Connie@albionconnect.com; Connie.Nathan@KMCTELECOM.COM; conniec@arrowcom.com; Craig@excleron.com; Craig.B.Douglas@MCI.com; CSoptic@birch.com; cstl@bellsouth.net; daddymax@netbci.com; daisy.ling@wcom.com; DDougherty@birch.com; Debra.Pasquale@btitele.com; default.user@BellSouth.com; DElliott@connectsouth.com; desiree@communitytelephone.com; dfoust@deltacom.com; dgraham@MANTISS.com; dkane@aspiretelecom.com; dmcmanus@Trivergent.com; DNapovanice@birch.com; DoBeck@MediaOne.com; don@amexcomm.com; donna.poe@knology.com; donnas@intetech.com; Doreen.E.Raia@wcom.com; dpetry@ix.netcom.com; Dwight.Scrivener@wcom.com; dwilliams@nowcommunications.com; ed.ramsden@cc.gte.com; EFarnell@broadband.att.com; EGunn@birch.com; Ellen.Neis@mail.sprint.com; Elliot.Wrann@dsl.net; eodell@dset.com; epadfield@nextlink.com; ESaeed@northpoint.net; ESingleton@eztalktelephone.com; evdoty@nextlink.com; eyu@TALK.COM; Faye.Restaino@dsl.net; fjohanson@covad.com; fouts@communitytelephone.com; frankb@cellone-ms.com; Fred.Brigham@wcom.com; Gary@CSII.net; generalg@cris.com; gerrig@Lightyearcom.com; Glenn.Sonnier@usunwired.com; gmelvin@Trivergent.com; gulfcoast@dotstar.net; Hwhittington@mpowercom.com; ialvarez@commsouth.net; jamesk@onisn.net; jayala@rhythms.net; jbritton@phonesforall.com; Jdavid4715@aol.com; JDuffey@PSC.STATE.FL.US; Jeff.Walker@accesscomm.com; Jennifers@universaltelecominc.com; jfuller@fairpoint.com; JG6837@ctmail.snet.com; jhoze@KMCTELECOM.COM; jim.lee@dsl.net; Jim.Meyers@wcom.com; jjohnson@idstelcom.com; jmclau@KMCTELECOM.COM; JMMaxwell@Intermedia.com; JoanC@networktelephone.net; Joanne Baxter; JOliver@birch.com; jose.aguilar@btitele.com; jshields@globalc-inc.com; JtWilson2@att.com; jwengert@newsouth.com; jwilwerding@birch.com; KAnderson@nwp.com; karen.grim@mail.sprint.com; karind@covad.com; Katherine.Hudler@espire.net; kathryn_hinds@globalcrossing.com; Kathryn.Phipps@btitele.com; kcooper@EFTIA.com; Kevin@albionconnect.com; KGillette-Hoskins@quintessent.net; khudson@nextlink.com; Kimberly.O.Williams@MCI.com; KKester@STIS.com; kmarshall@telstar.org; kmiller@northpointcom.com; KPollard@birch.com; kschwart@covad.com; ktimmons@att.com; ktrygges@covad.com; KUchida@northpoint.net; Kyle Kopytchak; launch-now.notify@cscoe.accenture.com; lavernek@arrowcom.com; LCamillo@nwp.com; l davidov@dset.com; len.chandler@btitele.com; LHamlin@birch.com; LHinton@PrismCSI.net; lijohnso@covad.com; linda@networkonecom.com; lindak@communitytelephone.com; lisa@annox.com; Lminasola@MediaOne.com; Lorraine.Watson@wcom.com; lortega@commsouth.net; lynn@mfn.net; lynnj@nowcommunications.com; Mandy.S.Jenkins@alltel.com; mark@annox.com; Mark.Mecca@dsl.net; Mary.I.Mitchell@xo.com; marybethkeane@kpmg.com; mattbeynon@ga.prestige.net; MatthewBaker@nwp.com; mcbrunnhilde@juno.com; mchappell@kpmg.com;

To:

MConnolly@birch.com; mconquest@itcdeltacom.com; mdominick@Trivergent.com;
 mer@networkwcs.com; MGimmi@nuvox.com; michael.dekorte@Lightyearcom.com;
 Micki.Jones@wcom.com; microsun@bellsouth.net; mkennedy@newsouth.com;
 mmclaughlin@dsset.com; MPatyk@connectsouth.com; msykes@telcordia.com; mt7210
 @momail.sbc.com; MWagner@birch.com; Nancy.Watt@RHTelCo.com;
 Natalie.Franklin@KMCTELECOM.COM; NDreier@birch.com;
 Nicole.Moorman@adelphiacom.com; nmunsie@commsouth.net; NStuckey@birch.com;
 PBarker@aol.com; PBohn@MediaOne.com; Pkinghorn@eztalktelephone.com;
 pmckay@momentumbusiness.com; PPinick@birch.com; prehm@nightfire.com;
 prichardson@Trivergent.com; PRubino@Z-TEL.com; PShah@EFTIA.com;
 Quan.Nguyen@KMCTELECOM.COM; Rae.Couvillion@wcom.com;
 rbennett@floridadigital.net; rbreckin@telcordia.com; rbuffa@interloop.net;
 rcostanzo@velocityky.com; Rdupraw@mpowercom.com; Renee.Clark@espire.net;
 Renee.Clift@dsl.net; reym@networktelephone.net; rharsila@commsouth.net;
 rhonda.calvert@adelphiacom.com; Rick.Whisamore@wcom.com; rjohnson@epicus.com;
 robert@alternativephone.com; Ronald.Klamer@wcom.com; rturkel@broadriver.com;
 ruth@mfn.net; RWilson@City.marietta.GA.US; sandra.k.evans@mail.sprint.com;
 sandra.kahl@wcom.com; Sandrajf@intetech.com; sbowling@caprock.com;
 SchubertJ@birch.com; schula.hobbs@dsl.net; Scott.Hibbard@wcom.com;
 SELEAZER@TALK.COM; shane@eatel.com; shannon.smith@itchold.com;
 sharon.arnett@mail.sprint.com; Sherry.Lichtenberg@wcom.com;
 Shirley.Roberts@KMCTELECOM.COM; SLively@Trivergent.com; smason@interloop.net;
 smoore@Trivergent.com; snole@kpmg.com; srober@KMCTELECOM.COM;
 SSapler@itcdeltacom.com; SSullivan@nwp.com; Stacia.Edwards@KMCTELECOM.COM;
 Steve.Filliaux@btitele.com; Steve.Moore@mail.sprint.com;
 steve.sulak@nowcommunications.com; steve.taff@allegiancetelecom.com;
 suee@Lightyearcom.com; susan.sherfey@btitele.com; svc-gate@telcordia.com;
 swargo@rhythms.net; talleylinda@mindspring.com; tami.m.swenson@accenture.com;
 Tanya.Finney@espire.net; Tara.Odems@allegiancetelecom.com; TAYLORJG@LCI.COM;
 taziz@epicus.com; tfry@commsouth.net; Tim@excleron.com; timw@networkonecom.com;
 Travis.Tindal@om1.al.bst.bls.com; TJStokes@Trivergent.com; Tlescudero@idstelcom.com;
 tmontemayer@MANTISS.com; tntel@bellsouth.net; Todd@CSII.net; tom.hyde@Cbeyond.net;
 tonyam@communitytelephone.com; trsmith@Trivergent.com; ts1336@sbc.com;
 TThompson2@broadband.att.com; Tyra.Hush@wcom.com; usfloridaoss@kpmg.com;
 valarie_reck@globalcrossing.com; wendy.hernandez@comporium.com;
 WFletcher@birch.com; wmknapek@Intermedia.com; wolfsbrg@cris.com;
 Yvette.Brown@espire.net; Zachary.Baudoin@KMCTELECOM.COM; bellsouth@nightfire.com;
 dreinig@att.com; cschneider@concretio.com; Lianne.Griffin@BellSouth.com;
 ssarem@mpowercom.com; pwilson@mpowercom.com;
 Debbie.Timmons@om1.al.bst.bls.com; Bill.York@wcom.com; donaldson@epb.net;
 jason@basicphone.org; jerry.hill@accesscomm.com; scott.emener@accesscomm.com;
 kcaudill@idstelcom.com

Subject:

RE: FTTF Action Items from 10/17/01 Conference Call

FTTF,

Question one did not represent what was asked of the Flow-through task force on 10/17/01. Network Telephone specifically requested to know what BST was doing to justify the shifts of flow-through percentages for the last three months. If reporting errors are found, and changes are made within the flow-through data, the CLEC community has a right to know, via the CCP, what changes BST is making to the back-end systems. If the flow-through task force cannot represent the flow-through report, where does a CLEC go?

Kyle Kopytchak
 Process Measurement
 Network Telephone
 KyleK@Networktelephone.net
 850.469.9904.1250
 888.432.4855.4.1250

-----Original Message-----

From: Change.Control@bridge.bellsouth.com

[mailto:Change.Control@bridge.bellsouth.com]
 Sent: Monday, October 22, 2001 6:22 PM
 To: Alan.Flanigan@twtelecom.com; alee@epicus.com;
 alejandro@amexcomm.com; amanda.hill@wcom.com; Annette.Cook@espire.net;
 annettey@lightyearcom.com; apatel3@telcordia.com;
 Lynn.Arthur@BellSouth.com; avincent@communitytelephone.com;
 bbil@4pra.com; BellSouth@quintessent.net; best2@surfsouth.com;
 bethh@communitytelephone.com; beverly.lockwood@btitele.com;
 billg@telcordia.com; blsinterfacecontrol@kpmg.com;
 bmurdo@KMCTELECOM.COM; Bob.Buerrosse@allegiancetelecom.com;
 bobik@att.com; bradbury@att.com; Brenda.Gant@KMCTELECOM.COM;
 Brent.McMahan@networktelephone.net; bseigler@att.com;
 BStowe@City.marietta.GA.US; bszafran@covad.com; bwellman@idstelcom.com;
 c-david.burley@wcom.com; c-Lorraine.Watson@wcom.com;
 c_and_m@bellsouth.net; caren.schaffner@wcom.com; CASHford@birch.com;
 cassandrap@networktelephone.net; Catherine.Gray@alltel.com;
 cbnaadmin@home.com; cchiavatti@usatelecominc.com; cdiacovelli@att.com;
 CDrake@City.marietta.GA.US; Cecere.Chris@broadband.att.com;
 cecilia.ortiz@adelpiacom.com; Cedric.Cox@wcom.com; cflanigan@uslec.com;
 changecontrol.bellsouth@onepointcom.com; Chapmanwe@cepb.com;
 charles.a.stahlberger@xo.com; charrison@mpowercom.com;
 chaynes@Trivergent.com; cheryl@eatel.com;
 cheryl_acosta@stratosoilandgas.com; chrisg@pvtel.net;
 Christine.Schnelle@wcom.com; christine.shelton@cc.gte.com;
 clarson@dset.com; clhawk@KMCTELECOM.COM; CoDavis@covad.com;
 colleen.e.sponseller@wcom.com; Connie@albionconnect.com;
 Connie.Nathan@KMCTELECOM.COM; conniec@arrowcom.com; Craig@excleron.com;
 Craig.B.Douglas@MCI.com; CSoptic@birch.com; csti@bellsouth.net;
 daddymax@netbci.com; daisy.ling@wcom.com; DDougherty@birch.com;
 Debra.Pasquale@btitele.com; default.user@BellSouth.com;
 DElliott@connectsouth.com; desiree@communitytelephone.com;
 dfoust@deltacom.com; dgraham@MANTISS.com; dkane@aspiretelecom.com;
 dmcmanus@Trivergent.com; DNapovanice@birch.com; DoBeck@MediaOne.com;
 don@amexcomm.com; donna.poe@knology.com; donnas@intetech.com;
 Doreen.E.Raia@wcom.com; dpetry@ix.netcom.com; Dwight.Scrivener@wcom.com;
 dwilliams@nowcommunications.com; ed.ramsden@cc.gte.com;
 EFarnell@broadband.att.com; EGunn@birch.com; Ellen.Neis@mail.sprint.com;
 Elliot.Wrann@dsl.net; eodell@dset.com; epadfield@nextlink.com;
 ESaeed@northpoint.net; ESingleton@eztalktelephone.com;
 evdoty@nextlink.com; eyu@TALK.COM; Faye.Restaino@dsl.net;
 fjohnson@covad.com; fouts@communitytelephone.com; frankb@cellone-ms.com;
 Fred.Brigham@wcom.com; Gary@CSII.net; generalg@cris.com;
 gerrig@lightyearcom.com; Glenn.Sonnier@usunwired.com;
 gmelvin@Trivergent.com; gulfcoast@dotstar.net;
 Hwhittington@mpowercom.com; ialvarez@commsouth.net; jamesk@onisn.net;
 jayala@rhythms.net; jbritton@phonesforall.com; Jdavid4715@aol.com;
 JDuffey@PSC.STATE.FL.US; Jeff.Walker@accesscomm.com;
 Jennifers@universaltelecominc.com; jfuller@fairpoint.com;
 JG6837@ctmail.snet.com; jhoze@KMCTELECOM.COM; jim.lee@dsl.net;
 Jim.Meyers@wcom.com; jjohnson@idstelcom.com; jmclau@KMCTELECOM.COM;
 JMMaxwell@Intermedia.com; JoanC@networktelephone.net;
 joanneb@networktelephone.net; JOliver@birch.com;
 jose.aguilar@btitele.com; jshields@globalc-inc.com; JtWilson2@att.com;
 jwengert@newsouth.com; jwilwerding@birch.com; KAnderson@nwp.com;
 karen.grim@mail.sprint.com; karind@covad.com;
 Katherine.Hudler@espire.net; kathryn_hinds@globalcrossing.com;
 Kathryn.Phipps@btitele.com; kcooper@EFTIA.com; Kevin@albionconnect.com;
 KGillette-Hoskins@quintessent.net; khudson@nextlink.com;
 Kimberly.O.Williams@MCI.com; KKester@STIS.com; kmarshall@telstar.org;
 kmiller@northpointcom.com; KPollard@birch.com; kschwartz@covad.com;
 ktimmmons@att.com; ktrygges@covad.com; KUchida@northpoint.net;
 Kyle.Kopytchak@networktelephone.net;
 launch-now.notify@cscoe.accenture.com; lavernek@arrowcom.com;
 LCamillo@nwp.com; ldavidov@dset.com; len.chandler@btitele.com;
 LHamlin@birch.com; LHinton@PrismCSI.net; lijohnso@covad.com;
 linda@networkonecom.com; lindak@communitytelephone.com; lisa@annox.com;
 Lminasola@MediaOne.com; Lorraine.Watson@wcom.com; lortega@commsouth.net;

lynn@mfnet.net; lynnj@nowcommunications.com; Mandy.S.Jenkins@alltel.com;
mark@annox.com; Mark.Mecca@dsl.net; Mary.I.Mitchell@xo.com;
marybethkeane@kpmg.com; mattbeynon@ga.prestige.net;
MatthewBaker@nwp.com; mcbrunnhilde@juno.com; mchappell@kpmg.com;
MConnolly@birch.com; mconquest@itcdeltacom.com;
mdominick@Trivergent.com; mer@networkwcs.com; MGimmi@nuvox.com;
michael.dekorte@Lightyearcom.com; Micki.Jones@wcom.com;
microsun@bellsouth.net; mkenedy@newsouth.com; mmclaughlin@dset.com;
MPatyk@connectsouth.com; msykes@telcordia.com; mt7210@momail.sbc.com;
MWagner@birch.com; Nancy.Watt@RHTelCo.com;
Natalie.Franklin@KMCTELECOM.COM; NDreier@birch.com;
Nicole.Moorman@adelphiacom.com; nmunsie@commsouth.net;
NSTuckey@birch.com; PBarker@aol.com; PBohn@MediaOne.com;
Pkinghorn@eztalktelephone.com; pmckay@momentumbusiness.com;
PPinick@birch.com; prehm@nightfire.com; prichardson@Trivergent.com;
PRubino@Z-TEL.com; PShah@EFTIA.com; Quan.Nguyen@KMCTELECOM.COM;
Rae.Couvillion@wcom.com; rbennett@floridadigital.net;
rbreckin@telcordia.com; rbuffa@interloop.net; rcostanzo@velocityky.com;
Rdupraw@mpowercom.com; Renee.Clark@espire.net; Renee.Clift@dsl.net;
reym@networktelephone.net; rharsila@commsouth.net;
rhonda.calvert@adelphiacom.com; Rick.Whisamore@wcom.com;
rjohnson@epicus.com; robert@alternativephone.com;
Ronald.Klamer@wcom.com; rturkel@broadriver.com; ruth@mfnet.net;
RWilson@City.marietta.GA.US; sandra.k.evans@mail.sprint.com;
sandra.kahl@wcom.com; Sandrajf@intetech.com; sbowling@caprock.com;
SchubertJ@birch.com; schula.hobbs@dsl.net; Scott.Hibbard@wcom.com;
SELAZER@TALK.COM; shane@eatel.com; shannon.smith@itchold.com;
sharon.arnett@mail.sprint.com; Sherry.Lichtenberg@wcom.com;
Shirley.Roberts@KMCTELECOM.COM; SLively@Trivergent.com;
smason@interloop.net; smoore@Trivergent.com; snole@kpmg.com;
srober@KMCTELECOM.COM; SStapler@itcdeltacom.com; SSullivan@nwp.com;
Stacia.Edwards@KMCTELECOM.COM; Steve.Filliaux@btitele.com;
Steve.Moore@mail.sprint.com; steve.sulak@nowcommunications.com;
steve.taff@allegiancetelecom.com; suee@Lightyearcom.com;
susan.sherfey@btitele.com; svc-gate@telcordia.com; swargo@rhythms.net;
talleylinda@mindspring.com; tami.m.swenson@accenture.com;
Tanya.Finney@espire.net; Tara.Odems@allegiancetelecom.com;
TAYLORJG@LCI.COM; taziz@epicus.com; tfry@commsouth.net;
Tim@excleron.com; timw@networkonecom.com;
Travis.Tindal@oml.al.bst.bls.com; TJStokes@Trivergent.com;
Tlescudero@idstelcom.com; tmontemayer@MANTISS.com; tntel@bellsouth.net;
Todd@CSII.net; tom.hyde@Cbeyond.net; tonyam@communitytelephone.com;
trsmith@Trivergent.com; tsl336@sbc.com; TThompson2@broadband.att.com;
Tyra.Hush@wcom.com; usfloridaoss@kpmg.com;
valarie_reck@globalcrossing.com; wendy.hernandez@comporium.com;
WFletcher@birch.com; wmknapek@Intermedia.com; wolfsbrg@cris.com;
Yvette.Brown@espire.net; Zachary.Baudoin@KMCTELECOM.COM;
bellsouth@nightfire.com; dreinig@att.com; cschneider@concretio.com;
Lianne.Griffin@BellSouth.com; ssarem@mpowercom.com;
pwilson@mpowercom.com; Debbie.Timmons@oml.al.bst.bls.com;
Bill.York@wcom.com; donaldson@epb.net; jason@basicphone.org;
jerry.hill@accesscomm.com; scott.emener@accesscomm.com;
kcaudill@idstelcom.com
Subject: ID: FTTF Action Items from 10/17/01 Conference Call

Distributed Message

Message sent by: Change Control /m6,mail6a

To unsubscribe from CCP, send a message to
list.manager@bridge.bellsouth.com with the Subject line: UNSUBSCRIBE
CCP

For online help, send a message with the subject HELP.

Kyle Kopytchak

From: Change.Control@bridge.bellsouth.com
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2001 2:33 PM
To: Kyle.Kopytchak@networktelephone.net
Subject: RE: FTTF Action Items from 10/17/01 Conference Call

Kyle,

Your appeal to the response sent to you by the FTTF regarding the Action Item has been referred to Gary Jones and team. (FTTF)

Your response will be sent back to you through Change Control.

Thanks,
Change Management Team

Kyle Kopytchak

From: Porter, Phillip [Phillip.Porter@bellsouth.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 06, 2001 2:22 PM
To: 'Kyle Kopytchak'
Cc: Gardner, Deborah L
Subject: RE: 8/9/01 conference call; CR #'s / ACNA to PMAP / LSR detail re port

9-06-01

Kyle,

I'm sorry you are having problems interpreting the error codes for the LSR Detail Report. There is no one in the PMAP group that can assist you with the understanding of the details of the error messages captured in this raw data. Our function has been to capture and report those LSRs by system that come into and flow-thru the systems as well as to calculate the flow-thru percentages. Utilizing the data provided in the LSR Detail Report is something your Account Team or Order Processing Center should be able to help you with. I know that Scott Griffin has made every effort to find someone that can assist you with the kind of detail that you are looking for, but if Scott has not been successful, there's nothing additional that I can do.

Phil Porter
 Manager - Performance Measurements

-----Original Message-----

From: Kyle Kopytchak [mailto:Kyle.Kopytchak@networktelephone.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2001 2:52 PM
To: 'Phillip.Porter@bellsouth.com'
Cc: 'Scott.Griffin@bridge.bellsouth.com'; Mitch Dantin; Craig Holloway
Subject: FW: 8/9/01 conference call; CR #'s / ACNA to PMAP / LSR detail report

Phil,

I am still needing some assistance understanding the LSR detail report as it relates to rejections and clarifications, and the err codes associated with them. Is there someone that can walk through portions of this report in an effort to assist in this manner?

Thanks, Kyle

-----Original Message-----

From: Scott.Griffin@bridge.bellsouth.com
 [mailto:Scott.Griffin@bridge.bellsouth.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2001 4:46 PM
To: Kyle.Kopytchak@networktelephone.net
Cc: Craig.Holloway@networktelephone.net; William.French2@bellsouth.com;
 Becky.Galey@bridge.bellsouth.com; Scott.Griffin@bridge.bellsouth.com;
 Cheryl.Lewis4@bridge.bellsouth.com; Joyce.Martin@bridge.bellsouth.com;
 Mitch.Dantin@networktelephone.net; Phillip.Porter@bellsouth.com;
 Pinky.Reichert@bellsouth.com
Subject: RE: 8/9/01 conference call; CR #'s / ACNA to PMAP / LSR detail report

Kyle-

I can not commit as to what the PMAP group can do in regards to this issue. I have recommended that you go to them for some guidance and as a result, they may be able to give you a better understanding of the codes and their report. Joyce and I have exhausted our resources and have provided you the information that has been provided to us.